Dear Howard, 6/30/76

You were superb on Nine in the Morning. I don't think anyone could have done better and I know very few I think could have done as well.

Jim phoned me afterward. He agrees.

The tape is enclosed. You didn't ask it but perhaps you want it. A review may be helpful, but I think only in minute and unimportant areas if at all.

Part of the reused tape may be of a conversation. The rest, both sides, is a broadcast to San Antonio, with a guy I mentioned to you long ago would do you by phone. Alan Dale. Your published can arrange it. It now, let me know and I will. After you get the feel of Dale please erase all byt you.

You were not superb not to phone us. Especially when it would have cost you nothing. Remember for the future that when a show puts you up they pick up all normal expenses. Use the restaurants of their accomodations, sign the check and include the tip on the check. The same is true of phone. There would jave been nothing wrong with your phoning us, your folks, etc., from your room. The stations and hotels/motels have a trade-deal/ arrangement. Remember this. It does not cost you or your publisher anything and it is normal and proper.

The skull slide is effective if, from the records I have not totally faithful in not showing the dust-like dispersal of fine fragments in the front of the head. On the screen the goat-chest bullet was not visible enough to make your point visibly, the putpose of slides. In all they were effective. If and when you can I'd appreciate a set. Students might also want to use them as they use mine. Of them the skull one is the only one I might want to use sometime.

You might want to refresh your recollection on the CBS shooting tests if that question comes up again. If you don't have them I do. About half the times malfunction and no single faithful duplication. When you mention Edgewood Arsenal again you might want to include "for the Commission." It emphasizes the point of suppression and knowing.

You may face a sotuation where you tape a show of they have a seven-second delay for beeping out. When you use the word "perjury," as you know, people can get sacred of suits and beep or edit. So I'd suggest that you consider this in the way you begin your response and include the doctors' own statement of the existence of fragments visible in those same X-rays they did examine and report on, for Clark.

The unsophisticated may not have understood you on Marina and why you did not try to speak to her. You may make it simpler by asking why interview and depend on the unsworn word of one who swore she was a liar and then use her words I have lied to now but henceforth I will not lie. You might also want to note she was a witness to nothing.

Don't feel you have to be as delicate as you were with Schweiker. Don't be afraid to say exactly what you think. You may in time regret it if you are not more straightforward than you were this monring. Jim finds my letter too moderate.His entire things is irrelevant as perfectly fits your title, presumed guilty. Without the establishing of guilt all he reports is irrelevant. In fact, unfair to the CIA and FBI. He failed to lay the basis for any reasonable conjecture. It thus is less than theorizing. And he supports Ford, who was a member of the Commission. In my experience honesty and straightforwardness on this is completely acceptable to the most conservative. This conservative: After a long conversation immediately after your show a Chicago Tribune correspondent is coming here Tuesday on it.

While these are all very minor suggestions after a really first-rate job, I do thnk you want to consider the Schweiker matter further. It will be a continuing question.

Best,